

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,014	07/31/2003	Christopher J. Calhoun	MA9606P	9368	
75	90 09/06/2006		EXAM	INER	
Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP Suite 300		SOROUSH, ALI			
4 Venture			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Irvine, CA 92	618		1616		
			DATE MAIL ED: 00/06/2004	DATE MAILED: 00/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/632,014	CALHOUN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Ali Soroush	1616			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)□	S) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)⊠	8) Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
A44 - 1-	Wal					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite			
3) Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-29 and 34-36 are drawn to a method of attenuating adhesion between an implant and surrounding tissue following surgical procedure, classified in class 424, subclass 426.
- II. Claims 30- 33 and 37-50 are drawn to an apparatus comprising an implant and a resorbable membrane surrounding the implant, classified in class 424, subclass 426.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case the instant claim the apparatus of an implant and a resorbable membrane surrounding the implant can be made by a variety of methods. One such example would be to apply the membrane as a paste to the implant and allowing the paste to cool and solidify on the implant. In searching Group I the Examiner will be focused on the patentability of the method of assembling or making an implant with a resorbable membrane wrapped, blanketed, draped, etc. around the implant. Conversely, in searching Group II the examiner will be searching an apparatus comprising an implant and resorbable membrane.

Art Unit: 1616

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election of Species

When applicant elects any of the Groups I or II, an election of species is required.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: a plurality of (a) implants and (b) surrounding tissue.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Claims of Group I and II read a plurality of (a) implants and (b) surrounding tissue, the search for all of which presents an undue burden on the Office.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election. It is requested that a single disclosed implant such as heart valves and a single disclosed surrounding tissue such as pericardium be elected. If applicant desires any further components to go along with the election examiner requests applicant to specifically name and/or specifically define the additional components. If applicant does not specifically or completely define additional

Application/Control Number: 10/632,014

Art Unit: 1616

components, claims comprising additional component will be considered non-elected claims. Additional components are usually in claims reciting "further comprising".

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Other Matters

Claims 34, 35, and 36 read "the method according to claim..." in which each claim referenced is an apparatus claim. Therefore, claims 34, 35, and 36 are improperly dependent on claims 33, 34, and 31, respectively. Claims 34, 35, and 36 have been grouped with the method claims in light of the claims' wording. It is suggested that the claims be amended to read properly from its dependency on claims 33, 34, and 31. At the time of the issuance of an official action comprising art, restriction will be briefly updated with respect to dependency correction in the official office action.

Election

A telephone call was made to Kenton Mullins on August 21, 2006 at 12:00pm to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Soroush whose telephone number is (571) 272-9925. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 5:00pm E.S.T..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,014 Page 7

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ali Soroush Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1616

> Alton Pryor Primary Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600